



PASBO School Operations Impact Award

The PASBO School Operations Impact Award, sponsored by PLGIT, may be awarded annually to a PASBO member, school or group of school employees who have undertaken a project and demonstrated making a significant impact in their school business operations. All areas of PASBO membership are encouraged to consider applying for this award.

Eligibility

- The PASBO School Operations Impact Award is open to any active PASBO member, active school entity, employee or group of active school entity employees in administrative or support areas.
- Members serving on the PASBO Board of Directors or the Awards Committee are ineligible.
- The application must be for a practice or idea that has been implemented within the last three years.
- All entries must be submitted with an official School Operations Impact Award application form. Entries must be postmarked to the PASBO office by November 30.

Please address the following in your submission narrative:

- Describe the process, in detail, including who was involved
- What were the positive impacts on the LEA (e.g. student benefit, financial efficiency, impact on staffing levels and morale, etc.)
- What were the positives impacts on outside stakeholders and/or the community (shared resources, improved relationships, tax rates, etc.)
- What were the positive impacts on PASB0 members (can this be shared and replicated?)
- Please limit your submission narrative to 5 pages of description.
- Please limit your supporting documentation to 10 pages. It should be relevant and tie directly to the application and submission. The committee may ask for further documentation if required.

Impact/Scoring Rubric

- 45% for impact to LEA (include criteria for size of the impact on a per pupil basis, number of people affected, etc.)
- 30% for impact to Community (include criteria for size of the impact, number of people affected, etc.)
- 25% for innovation and impact to PASBO membership (explain to other PASBO members how this practice or idea was innovative and can be implement)

PASBO School Operations Impact Award Application

| Contact Name: | |
|--|---|
| Title: | |
| LEA: | |
| Email: | Phone: |
| Title of Project: | |
| | |
| | |
| Certification | 1 |
| The undersigned attest that the information included in this a | oplication and all submittals are true and accurate |
| Signature of Chief School Administrator | Date |
| Signature of Chief School Business Official | Date |
| Signature of Individual Submitting the Application | |

SIGNATURE PAGE: Please attach a signed copy of this page with your application.





PASBO School Operations Impact Award

Scoring Rubric

| ubmission Name: | Evaluator's Name: |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| | |

| Category | Scoring Guidelines | | | | | Points Earned |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|------------------|
| Local Education Agency (LEA) – Fiscal Impact (15 points) | 0 1 2 3 Minimal to No Impact: No demonstrable financial benefit or insufficient evidence. | 4 5 6 Limited: Minor financial benefit. Examples: small cost reductions, minor process improvements, or limited efficiency gains. Minimal documentation. | 7 8 9 Moderate: Meaningful financial improvement. Examples: moderate cost savings, improved purchasing processes, energy efficiencies, or reduced administrative costs. Some supporting data. | 10 11 12 Strong: Significant measurable financial benefit. Examples: notable cost reductions, improved budget allocation, streamlined operations, or successful grant acquisition. Good documentation. | 13 14 15 Exceptional: Major financial benefit with sustained results. Examples: substantial cost savings, significant operational efficiencies, avoided major expenditures, or enhanced revenue generation. Strong documentation with clear ROI. | |
| Local Education Agency (LEA) – Impact on Students (15 points) | 0 1 2 3 Minimal to No Impact: No demonstrable student benefit. | 4 5 6 Limited: Minimal student benefit with weak documentation. | 7 8 9 Moderate: Some improvement with reasonable evidence. Examples: minor facility improvements, updated equipment, or enhanced processes that benefit students. | 10 11 12 Strong: Clear positive impact on students with good supporting evidence. Examples: improved facilities, enhanced technology access, better transportation, or expanded programs. | 13 14 15 Exceptional: Significant, measurable improvement in student outcomes. Examples: enhanced learning environments, improved safety protocols, better access to resources, increased engagement opportunities, or strengthened support services. Multiple data sources. | |
| Local Education Agency (LEA) – Impact on Staff (15 points) | 0 1 2 3 Minimal to No Impact: No demonstrable staff benefit. | 4 5 6 Limited: Minimal staff benefit with weak documentation. | 7 8 9 Moderate: Some improvement with reasonable evidence. Examples: minor process improvements, updated equipment, or enhanced workplace amenities. | 10 11 12 Strong: Clear positive impact on staff with good supporting evidence. Examples: reduced administrative burden, improved communication systems, better resource access, or enhanced collaboration tools. | 13 14 15 Exceptional: Significant improvement in staff experience and effectiveness. Examples: enhanced working conditions, improved work-life balance, streamlined processes, better professional development opportunities, or increased job satisfaction. Strong evidence. | |
| Community – Economic Impact on Taxpayers (15 points) | 0 1 2 3 Minimal to No Impact: No demonstrable economic benefit. | 4 5 6 Limited: Minor taxpayer benefit with weak documentation. | 7 8 9 Moderate: Some taxpayer benefit with reasonable evidence. Examples: minor cost avoidance, improved budget transparency, or small efficiency gains. | 10 11 12 Strong: Clear economic benefit with solid documentation. Examples: meaningful cost savings passed to taxpayers, successful bond refinancing, or effective resource sharing initiatives. | 13 14 15 Exceptional: Major economic benefit to taxpayers. Examples: tax rate stabilization, significant cost avoidance, avoided tax increases, enhanced property values, or substantial budget efficiencies benefiting the community. Clear documentation. | |



PASBO School Operations Impact Award

Scoring Rubric

| Community – | 0 1 2 3 | 4 5 6 | 7 8 9 | 10 11 12 | 13 14 15 | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Non-Financial | Minimal to No Impact: No | Limited: Minor community | Moderate: Some improvement | Strong: Clear positive impact | Exceptional: Significant | |
| Impact | demonstrable community | benefit with weak | with limited evidence. | with good evidence. | community benefit. Examples: | |
| (15 points) | benefit. | documentation. | | | enhanced trust, new | |
| | | | | | partnerships, improved district | |
| | | | | | reputation, increased civic | |
| | | | | | engagement. Multiple evidence | |
| | | | | | sources. | |
| PASBO – | 0 1 2 | 3 4 | 5 6 | 7 8 | 9 10 | |
| Replicability | Not Replicable: No path for | Difficult to Replicate: Limited | Somewhat Replicable: Basic | Moderately Replicable: Good | Highly Replicable: Detailed | |
| (10 points) | other LEA's to implement. | guidance. High resource | guidance provided but significant | guidance, reasonable resource | roadmap provided. Clear | |
| | Unique circumstances prevent | requirements or context-specific | adaptation required. Moderate | requirements. Some adaptation | resources. Evidence of successful | |
| | replication. | factors limit transferability. | barriers. | needed. | transfer to other contexts. | |
| | | | | | Minimal barriers to adoption. | |
| PASBO – | 0 1 2 3 | 4 5 6 | 7 8 9 | 10 11 12 | 13 14 15 | |
| Innovation | Not Innovative: Standard | Limited Innovation: Minor | Moderately Innovative: Some | Innovative: Creative adaptation | Highly Innovative: Truly novel | |
| (15 points) | implementation of well- | improvements to existing | creative elements or improved | of existing concepts or novel | approach not documented | |
| | established practices. | practices. | approach to common challenges. | application to K-12 context. Clear | elsewhere in K-12. | |
| | | | | advancement beyond standard | Transformative thinking with | |
| | | | | practice. | potential field-wide impact. | |
| EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS: | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | TOTAL SCORE → | |
| | | | | | | |

Revised 08/2025